YIVO ENGLISH TRANSLATION SERIES

The material contained in this publication was first published in the *Yivo Bleter,* Journal of the Yiddish Scientific Institute — Yivo, XXIV, 2 (November-December, 1944). In view of its general public interest, it is being offered in an English edition.

COPYRIGHT 1945 BY THE YIDDISH SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTE—YIVO
Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

	Page
The Subject of the Inquiry	7
The Circular Letter and the Questionnaire	10
The Replies	14
The Need for Specific Data on Jewish Immigrants — Jacob Lestchinsky	83
Forty-Five Years of Controversy: Should Jewish Immigrants Be Classified as Jews? — Nathan Goldberg	90
Summary and Conclusions — Max Weinreich	106

THE SUBJECT OF THE INQUIRY

On November 8, 1943, Mr. Earl G. Harrison, then Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, issued instruction No. 177 which provided that in the future the Jews entering the country should not be classified as Jews. The essence of the new procedure was explained by the Service as follows: [1]

> The immigration law requires that certain statistical data be kept in the cases of aliens arriving in the United States. One item to be recorded is race. For many years the term "Hebrew" was one of many terms used in recording the race of entrants. After considerable study on the part of the Department of Justice and this Service, it was found desirable to discontinue the use of the term "Hebrew" in preparing records. The race designation of persons formerly recorded as Hebrew will now be governed by the country of their origin. The term "Hebrew" is being deleted from manifest forms used by transportation companies and from forms used by the Service. When these forms are reprinted, the term will be omitted.

In the *Yivo Bleter*, vol. XXIII, 2 (March - April, 1944, pp. 282-283), the Yivo compiled the pertinent facts in somewhat greater detail and thus brought them to the attention of the public—for the first time, to our knowledge, in any specialized or general publication. That brief presentation confined itself to the facts and refrained from comment. It was not that the staff members who dealt with the matter did not have a definite opinion on the subject. They did. We had, however, to take into consideration that this was a matter which evoked considerable difference of opinion. We therefore felt that it was our task as a research institution not simply to pass judgment but to explore public opinion.

As a scholarly body, we are interested, to begin with, in the opinions of scholars: sociologists, statisticians, demographers, anthropologists. Needless to say that we did not differentiate between Jews and non-Jews. Nor did we choose the addressees according to the opinion we expected them to voice; in most of the cases we had no inkling of that opinion. We were interested only in the addressee's qualifications.

[1] In a letter to the Yivo, April 3, 1944.

We were, however, cognizant of the fact that we dealt with a difficult problem that had divided the Jewish community for almost a half-century, by no means for scientific reasons, but for reasons of public policy. Whether a particular opinion is correct or incorrect, whether one or another public action is objectively advisable or harmful, there is no doubt that all groups have been guided by the desire to find a solution in the interest of the Jewish people. We thought, therefore, that we should also put our questions before the representatives of large Jewish organizations which are distinguished by their membership or their influence.

When we consider that about 200 letters sent out by us brought 140 replies,[2] and a certain number of replies promised was not submitted for purely incidental reasons, we may state that the response to the inquiry was very animated. The replies are as satisfactory from the point of view of content as well as of number; while some are short and written rather formally, others present detailed and reflective analyses and frequently also contain valuable proposals of a practical nature.

At the outset we had thought that a summation of the replies according to point of view with the occasional insertion of quotations would suffice. But upon acquaintance with the materials, we came to the conclusion that precisely the subtle shades of opinion would vanish by such procedure and this would be a loss indeed. The very idea of the inquiry had been to illuminate the many-faceted problems from as many sides as possible. The plan of the publication was, therefore, enlarged. Following the text of the questionnaire and the covering letter, all replies are given *verbatim;* only the salutations and the complimentary closings of the letters are omitted. Two articles analyzing particular aspects of the problem are then given and at the end the reader will find the summary and conclusions.

It may seem doubtful at first glance whether it was worth delving so deeply into a matter which is, after all, limited in its importance. But as soon as we examine the material proper, these doubts disappear. The topic discussed here is not a matter of statistical technique in which only experts are interested; as one of the writers justly remarks, "a profound social issue" is here at stake. It turns out that this particular

[2] The letter listed under [140] was not actually sent as a reply to the questionnaire, but as an answer to our inquiry about the situation in Canada. It has, however, been included in the collection of replies since it falls within their scope and aids in shedding light on the same problems.

We take this opportunity to note that several correspondents suggested that we submit the questionnaire to persons they specified. Their suggestions were followed through and such additional replies as were received are included among the letters.

matter is only a test case and sometimes we get the impression that the discussion concerns not only the classification of immigrants but the most varied aspects of what is called by the inclusive but somewhat vague term "Jewish problem."

We trust, therefore, that this publication will arouse the interest it deserves. We duly appreciate the cooperation of all scholars and public leaders who participated in the inquiry. We also thank, in advance, all readers who will be kind enough to send us their remarks.

THE CIRCULAR LETTER AND THE QUESTIONNAIRE

July 28, 1944

Dear Sir or Madam:

May we have your opinion on the following matter that seems to us of considerable importance?

You are probably aware of the fact that the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service issued an instruction at the end of last year which eliminated the term "Hebrew" from the classification of immigrants arriving in this country. In a letter to this Institute, dated April 3, 1944, the Service states:

> After considerabe study on the part of the Department of Justice and this Service, it was found desirable to discontinue the use of the term "Hebrew" in preparing records. The race designation of persons formerly recorded as Hebrew will now be governed by the country of their origin.

From a preliminary survey made by a member of our research staff, it appears that the Attorney General felt that there had been difficulty in determining who among persons of various nationalities should be classed as Hebrews. Consequently, persons who have heretofore been recorded as of the Hebrew race are now to be designated as members of whichever of the forty-odd races and peoples enumerated on page 6 of General Order No. 162 is most appropriate. The instruction then proceeds to say:

> In so doing, religious beliefs should be disregarded but the language spoken by and the country of residence of the applicant and his ancestors and other similar facts may be taken into consideration. For example, a Russian-speaking person who formerly would have been recorded as belonging to the Hebrew race and who was born in Russia and has resided there, the same being true of his ancestors, may properly be recorded as a member of the Russian race. Where such criteria are non-existent, such a person may properly be classified as a member of the White race in the same way as persons recorded as belonging to the Mexican race have been recorded since July 20, 1937 as persons of the White race.

Obviously this decision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service presents a very real problem. Both Jewish communal leaders and social scientists, Jews and non-Jews alike, need as accurate data as possible on the number of Jewish immigrants entering the country, their

occupational structure, etc. In this respect the evidence of the official immigration statistics has been extremely useful, and the new procedure which submerges the Jews in other territorially defined races or in the White race as a whole seems to be definitely worse than the previous one. Would it not be quite inaccurate, for instance, to attribute to the "Russian race" a Jew whose mother tongue is Yiddish, even if he speaks Russian too? And how is the immigration officer to classify a Jew coming to this country from the Georgian republic in the U. S. S. R.? By this new ruling we are thrown back to the period prior to 1899, for which, in matters concerning Jewish immigration, one has to rely on estimates and guesswork for lack of statistics.

It may be argued that the official presentation of data on the Jews focuses public attention on them and thus foments anti-Semitism. But it seems that accurate knowledge is the best weapon in public life and that anti-Jewish propaganda may easily invent fantastic numbers of Jewish immigrants allegedly flooding the country, if exact figures will be lacking. The disappearance of the term "Hebrew race," which was vague from the outset and is nowadays reminiscent of Hitlerite racial philosophy, may seem commendable just as the whole classification into "races" may be considered inadequate. But if so, could not some other classification be found, in general and particularly for the Jews, instead of simply avoiding the issue?

In view of the importance of the question, this Institute has decided to address an inquiry to a selected number of scholars and public leaders to obtain a cross-section of qualified opinion on the subject. We contemplate publishing the comments. Please be kind enough to give us your opinion on the enclosed form. We shall appreciate your writing at greater length, if you care to do so.

We hope to have your reply at your earliest convenience. Thank you in advance.

Very truly yours,

MAX WEINREICH
Research Director

JACOB LESTCHINSKY
Research Secretary, Section of Economics and Statistics

[The following questionnaire was enclosed.]

1. Do you think it is important to have exact data on the immigration of Jews into this country, or do you see any reasons for refraining from collecting these data?

2. If you do not approve of the decision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service as to the deletion of the term "Hebrew" from

the classification of immigrants, would you simply recommend a return to the previous procedure as far as the Jews are concerned, or, if not, what change would you suggest?

3. Do you consider the classification of immigrants according to "race" appropriate? If not, what other designation would you suggest?

Name .....

Address .....

Position .....

....., 1944

REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE WERE RECEIVED FROM

(The figure indicates the number of the reply)

Allport, Floyd H., 134
Allport, Gordon W., 8
Asofsky, I. L., 58

Bain, Read, 25
Baron, Salo W., 74
Baskin, Joseph, 60
Benedict, Ruth, 53
Bernard, L. L., 64
Blumer, Herbert, 110
Bogardus, E. S., 41
Bowden, A. O., 54
Bradley, Phillips, 73
Brunner, Edmund, 27
Bryson, Gladys, 95

Cantor, Nathaniel, 92
Carpenter, Niles, 30
Chamberlain, J. P., 19
Chapin, F. Stuart, 28
Croxton, Frederick E., 113

Davie, Maurice R., 9
Davis, Kingsley, 103
Dijour, Ilya, 40
Dollard, John, 43
Dubinsky, David, 105
Dublin, Louis I., 2

Ellwood, Charles A., 33
Engelman, Uriah Z., 39

Feldman, H., 97
Finkelstein, Louis, 4
Freehof, Solomon B., 67

Gillin, J. L., 22
Ginzberg, Eli, 68
Goldman, Robert P., 81
Gottschalk, Louis, 26
Gottschalk, Max, 83, 119
Gutstadt, Richard E., 47

Hacker, Louis M., 98
Hankins, Frank H., 6
Harrison, Shelby M., 120
Hauser, Philip M., 49
Herskovits, Melville J., 32
Hook, Sidney, 15
Horkheimer, Max, 117
Hotelling, Harold, 69
Hurlbutt, Mary E., 93

Jacobs, Melville, 38
Janowsky, Oscar I., 70
Joseph, Samuel, 137

Kahn, Dorothy C., 80
Kallen, H. M., 125
Karpf, Maurice, 133
Kennedy, Raymond, 3
Kirkpatrick, Clifford, 42
Kiser, Clyde V., 57
Klein, Philip, 66
Koenig, Samuel, 21
Kohanski, Alexander, 46
Kohs, S. C., 1

Konvitz, Milton R., 17
Kroeber, A. L., 107

Lane, Robert P., 115
Lazarsfeld, Paul F., 37
Lehrer, Leibush, 91
Leiserson, William, 106
Lemieux, O. A., 140
Levy, Beryl Harold, 108
Lindeman, Eduard C., 99
Linfield, H. S., 96
Linton, Ralph, 13
Lorge, Irving, 111
Lorwin, Lewis L., 138
Lowie, Robert H., 35
Lundberg, George A., 61
Lurie, H. L., 5

MacIver, R. M., 24
Mahler, Raphael, 102
Maller, J. B., 119
Morgenstern, Julian, 71
Mueller, John H., 62
Murphy, Gardner, 36

North, Cecil C., 20
Notestein, Frank W., 65

Odum, Howard W., 89
Ogburn, William F., 75

Payne, E. George, 123
Perlman, Selig, 78
Pinson, Koppel S., 63
Proskauer, Joseph M., 118

Razran, Gregory S., 77
Reed, Lowell J., 7
Reich, Nathan, 124
Reuter, E. B., 34
Rice, Stuart A., 129
Roback, A. A., 55
Robinson, Jacob, 72
Robison, Sophia M., 116
Rosenbach, A. S. W., 130
Ross, Edward A., 23
Ross, Frank A., 56
Roucek, Joseph S., 121

Sachar, A. L., 122
Schmid, Calvin F., 50
Schneiderman, Harry, 119
Schoen, Max, 16
Selekman, B. M., 112
Shapiro, H. L., 45
Shuster, George N., 44
Silver, Edward S., 76
Sims, Newell L., 18
Slawson, John, 119
Sletto, Raymond F., 126
Soltes, Mordecai, 94
Sorokin, Pitirim A., 12
Steiner, Jesse F., 52
Stern, Bernhard J., 88
Stonequist, Everett V., 135
Sutherland, Edwin H., 87

Taeuber, Conrad, 29
Taeuber, Irene B., 114
Taft, Donald R., 14
Tartakower, Arieh, 136
Thomas, Dorothy S., 85
Thomas, W. I., 48
Thompson, Warren S., 11
Timasheff, N. S., 10
Truesdell, L. E., 82

van Kleeck, Mary, 139
Vishniak, Mark, 128

Wald, A., 101
Walker, Helen M., 127
Waller, Willard, 31
Weinberg, Max H., 131
Whelpton, P. K., 79
Wirth, Louis, 86
Wischnitzer, Mark, 109
Wise, Stephen S., 132
Wood, Arthur Evans, 100
Wright, Quincy, 104

Young, Pauline V., 90

Zaritsky, Max, 84
Znaniecki, Florian, 51
Zorbaugh, F. M., 59

The answers nos. 91, 102, 105, postscript to 109, 124, 131 were written in Yiddish; no. 128 in Russian.

THE REPLIES

1

1. It is extremely important to have exact data on the immigration of Jews into this country and some method should be devised, not merely to continue securing this information, but to provide more detailed information on each immigrant, if at all possible.

2. I believe this matter should be determined by a committee of Jewish statisticians and sociologists and with various Jewish communal leaders. Some designation should be provided that would be clear and unambiguous.

3. The designation of immigrants according to "race" is utterly inadequate and misleading as has been frequently pointed out. This matter too should have the attention of the kind of committee suggested in answer to your second question.

[The following letter was enclosed.]

Am glad that the Yivo has undertaken to canvass the opinion of scholars, research men and Jewish community leaders on the question of the discontinuance of the listing of Jews among the group of immigrants entering the United States.

Of course, you realize that the discontinuance was moved by strong, though not numerically superior, American Jewish influences—and especially by that group which insists that the Jewish people differ from all other Americans only in religion, and that in everything else we are the same as everyone else.

I am in absolute agreement with those who believe that by illuminating and permitting the world to gaze upon *all* aspects of Jewish life, we will be building stronger defenses against anti-Semitism, than by pulling down the shades, turning out the lights and singing "God Save America" in the dark!

It would be interesting to see your summary of the returns from the different people to whom you are writing. This entire question isn't one, of course, which is limited merely to gathering information about Jewish immigration into this country. Your questions relate to the entire issue of the gathering of any figures of any kind about Jews in the United States except that information which is made available only through the decennial census of religious bodies.

I do hope that as a result of your inquiry this whole question will be brought to the attention of some important Jewish national body so that we may steer our course clearly for the future and get out of our statistical morasses.

S. C. Kohs, *Director, Bureau of War Records, National Jewish Welfare Board*

2

1. I think it is important to have exact data on the immigration of Jews into this country, but I would not attempt to obtain it through the official sources. It should be entirely possible to obtain figures through welfare agencies serving immigrants, which is, after all, a very effective method.

2. I would not recommend a return to the previous procedure as far as Jews are concerned. I think the official decision was right. There is no reason why the Government should take notice of the religion of immigrants. It is their own affair. I see no reason either why the Government should treat Jews differently from other immigrants. Its present procedure is to list them according to country of origin and that should prevail for Jews as well. If Jews are interested in their own people for welfare reasons, they should go ahead and find out through proper channels of service.

3. The sooner we get away from race designations, the better. The whole concept of race is utterly unscientific and meaningless and a source of endless trouble for everyone concerned. The only sensible procedure is the one that the Government now proposes and that is to classify people according to the political nomenclature of countries of origin. If for other reasons it is necessary to distinguish white from colored, there is no reason why that distinction should not be made.

Louis I. Dublin, *3rd Vice-President and Statistician, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.*

3

1. Yes [important to have exact data].

2. Ask for "religion." Since Jews are losing Yiddish as a "mother tongue" (e.g., in England, Germany, France), the question of language is losing significance. The Jews are essentially a religious group.

3. Ask for "nationality" and for "race." Latter should have four classes: Negro, White, Mongolian, and "Other." Present "race" data is confused with "nationality."

Raymond Kennedy, *Associate Professor of Sociology, Yale University*

4

1. It is most important, but this data should be collected by a Jewish agency. That would involve expense, but it would be very well worthwhile, especially as every effort should be made to keep our government from becoming involved in questions of religious distinctions and the problems of racism.

2. I definitely approve the decision of the Immigration and Naturaization Service.

3. I do not consider the classification of immigrants according to race appropriate. There is no reason to introduce into American official forms the Nazi concept of race. Immigrants should be classified according to their country of origin, especially because of the need to observe the naturalization laws of the United States.

Louis Finkelstein, *President, Jewish Theological Seminary*

5

I would suggest that you take this subject up with the Conference on Jewish Relations, Committee on Population Studies. As you probably know, efforts have been made by Jewish and other groups to avoid the U. S. Census Bureau's undertaking to list religion in its regular decennial census. Dr. H. S. Linfield, who prepares data for the U. S. Census Bureau, is firmly convinced that such classification is undesirable and some of the Jewish agencies, for example, the American Jewish Committee, concerned with public relation problems, seem to agree with Dr. Linfield. If this attitude is correct it is consistent to eliminate similar classifications from other government statistics. The term "Hebrew" especially is unscientific as a racial or ethnic classification and its use by the Immigration Department seems to have been a subterfuge to avoid using an outright religious classification. It would certainly be advisable not to make any attempts to change the present ruling of the Immigration Department without first reaching an agreement on the more important questions relating to the U. S. Census.

My personal view is that the religious classification might be valid for statistical purposes if serious political questions were not thereby raised. In this country where Jews have been immigrants for several centuries a racial classification would be meaningless for the assimilated descendants of the earlier immigrants.

I would suggest that before you proceed further with your problem you ask the Conference on Jewish Relations to call a conference of interested Jewish organizations to see whether any definite agreement can be reached on desirable policies.

H. L. Lurie, *Executive Director, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc.*

6

1. Exact data seem highly desirable. They are essential to all students of the composition of the American population. They constitute a safeguard against exaggerations of the number and growth of the Jewish element.

2. It would seem that the new ruling serves no useful purpose. It reduces the value of official statistics by reducing the extent and quality of their immediate information and makes them less useful for social research purposes. At the same time the term "Hebrew" is not a satisfactory one as a designation of "race." However, for the present I should prefer a return to the previous procedure for the preservation of the continuity and clarity of the official data.

3. We certainly need some such designation and we should not yield to anti-Nazi sentiments by abandoning common sense. The Jews have long objected to this immigration regulation, but I think they are entirely mistaken in thinking it has anything to do with anti-Semitism. This latter sentiment is most prevalent among those classes of the population that never consult the immigration reports.

Frank H. Hankins, *Professor, Smith College*

7

To answer your questions categorically would carry implications that I do not care to make. I am therefore typing this statement of my position on the back of this sheet.

It seems to me there are two plans for collecting statistical information under which we might use the word "Hebrew": one if we were to make a racial breakdown of all immigrants and the other if we were to make a religious breakdown.

Since it has been clear that we cannot make a racial breakdown, *in general,* I see no reason for attempting to keep figures for the Jews as a race.

With regard to religion, it seems to me important that we do not pay attention to the religion of the individual in connection with our immigration policy, and I should therefore not be in favor of making an exception here in the case of the Jew.

In other words, I believe that our decision with regard to officially collecting statistics on the Jew should be governed by our future policy as to the collection of figures on a racial or religious classification and not on the basis of making an exception with regard to the Jew.

Lowell J. Reed, *Professor of Biostatistics and Dean, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University*

8

1. I do not feel that I have given enough thought to this problem to express anything more than a hesitant opinion. My inclination is to favor the new ruling, and to wish that "race" designations were eliminated from all immigration records.

2. [No answer.]

3. I think this classification is inappropriate since there is no acceptable definition of "race." Country of origin seems sufficient to me. After immigrants have arrived, our USA censuses will keep us posted on approximately the number of Jewish-religionists there are. What more do we need?

Gordon W. Allport, *Chairman, Department of Psychology, Harvard University*

9

1. Definitely important [to have exact data]. The same applies to the exact designation of all groups.

2. Immigration Service might well collect information on Religion, Mother Tongue, and Country of Origin. Nationality affiliation is the important thing, not "race."

3. Should be Race and Nationality. If classification by race then "Negro, Mongolian, Caucasian, Other."

Maurice R. Davie, *Professor of Sociology, Yale University*

10

1. It is important [to have exact data on immigrants].

2. The immigrant should be asked whether he wants to be classified as Hebrew, or as a person belonging to another group designated by the country of origin.

3. The term "race" is inappropriate; I suggest the term "ethnic group" (the connotation is purely cultural).

N. S. Timasheff, *Professor of Psychology, Fordham University*

11

1. Yes! [I see reasons for refraining from collecting data on immigrants.] As long as any group considers it important to be classed in some separate category, peculiar to itself, it will almost certainly be thought of as "peculiar" by the remainder of the population. This is especially true if this category carries implications of "race" differences as the term Hebrew probably does.

2. I do not know what the best practice would be. I do not like any arbitrary classification which tends to perpetuate the idea of basic differences which cannot be softened and perhaps eliminated by education and wide social contacts.

3. No! I do not [consider the classification of immigrants according to "race" appropriate]. I should much prefer to see some classification by "mother tongue" or religion. "Race" is a misleading term in that it implies biological differences. It should not be used except where there is clear evidence of such differences.

Warren S. Thompson, *Director, Scripps Foundation*

12

1. Yes, it is important to have exact data.

2. Both are unsatisfactory. The best method is: double indication of the country of emigration, plus, Jewish (Hebrew) ethnic group (e.g. Hebrew, U. S. S. R.).

3. "Race" is certainly a misnomer. "Nationality" or "ethnic group" is much more accurate and scientific.

Pitirim A. Sorokin, *Professor, Harvard University*

13

1. It does not seem to me it is particularly important to have exact data on immigration of Jews into this country, and in eliminating the term "Hebrew" from the classification of immigrants I feel that the Service was probably deferring to the wishes of most Jews now in America. I see no particular reason for refraining from collecting these data but I question whether they are of particular significance.

2. [No answer.]

3. It seems to me that the only appropriate classification of immigrants is by nationality. The term "race" as used by anthropologists would not apply to Jews or to any of the present European national groups.

Ralph Linton, *Professor of Anthropology, Columbia University*

14

1. I believe such facts are important and should be known.

2. If the purpose was to eliminate a false "racial" category it is to that extent, I think, to be commended. However, it is a step backward to return to the situation in 1899. In addition to "country of origin" we need to know for all groups (including Hebrews) the cultural background and group affiliation.

3. No, the category race is properly a biological category which should be wholly eliminated except, perhaps, for the major color "races" —even these are not true races. A government document should not contribute to such an unscientific use of popular terms.

[The following letter was enclosed.]

I am interested in your letter concerning the elimination of the category "Hebrew" from immigration statistics, and I agree with its implied argument.

Of course any kind of information may be used for social or unsocial purposes, but we need the information.

The category "races and peoples" has never been accurate and has contributed to popular misunderstanding of problems of "race" relations.

It seems to me that we need to know how many Hebrews enter and leave the United States. It seems to me that this information could be collected if trained investigators were to inquire into (1) the objective culture of the immigrant; (2) his attitudes toward his cultural affiliation; (3) the attitudes of others with whom he has associated as to that affiliation.

The objective culture would be indicated in answers as to his language, religious affiliation, residence in cultural areas, etc. Yet we need

to supplement this objective information with still more important information as to attitudes. For certain purposes is not a Hebrew a man or woman who either (a) thinks of himself as a Hebrew, or (b) is thought of as a Hebrew by his associates? Or both? It is these attitudes which define real social problems of the day. No doubt difficulties would arise in determining these attitudes and the relative weight to give to objective data, personal attitudes, and attitudes of others. Normally these difficulties would be slight, and with a trained staff borderline cases could be classified with greater accuracy and meaningfulness than at present. I believe that similar methods could be used with other than Hebrew groups.

Even if we were to confine ourselves to objective cultural data, that would be preferable to the elimination of the attempt altogether.

Donald R. Taft, *Professor of Sociology, University of Illinois*

15

1. Yes. [Important to have exact data.]

2. The subject is very difficult, and I am writing my offhand impressions which I may want to modify in the light of further knowledge. Under certain circumstances I can see a gain in the revised procedure. For example, suppose that the U. S. government allocates, as it should have in the last few years, the entire quota of a country to the persecuted and exiled Jews from that country. It might be easier to accomplish this if all the Jews entered as "nationals" of that particular country. The anti-Semites and reactionaries could not object with as much effectiveness if 40,000 Poles entered as immigrants as they could if 40,000 Polish Jews were admitted. At the same time, we want the data. Why could not a supplementary line be added—*to be voluntarily* filled out—indicating "religious" affiliation, if any. Among immigrant Jews, especially, the term religious affiliation is broadly interpreted. No matter whether they are orthodox or unorthodox, believers or Spinozists, or even Marxists, Jews would indicate that they are Jewish or Hebraic. The leaders of the immigrant groups might be requested to cooperate by informing immigrants of the importance of registering in this way in order to facilitate helping them subsequently to settle in various places, etc.

If questions—even voluntary ones—about religion are forbidden, then I ponder whether your institute knows of any methods by which Jews, who enter as nationals, could be counted, etc., *after* they settle in America. If these data could be gathered, even with some difficulty, after they have become part of the American population, it seems to me that it would be a net gain were the designation of "race" dropped from official inquiry. I am under the impression that the statistical study of Jewish immigration, occupation, etc. has made great strides in perfecting new methods and techniques of collecting and interpreting data, so that you would *not* be thrown back on the pre-1899 guesswork and

estimates. But I may be mistaken about this. I should like to know. In the future we may witness group immigration rather than individual immigration and such group immigration would have to take place with the help and knowledge of philanthropic agencies which would have their representatives both abroad and at the disembarkation points here.

Sidney Hook, *Dept. of Philosophy, New York University*

16

1. I can't see any valid reason why "Hebrew" should be eliminated—what is to be gained by it. We certainly want to have figures on the number of immigrant Jews to this country.

2. Why not indicate the country from which the "Hebrew" emigrated?

3. The term "race" other than *white, black,* etc., is now utterly meaningless.

Max Schoen, *Head, Dept. of Psychology and Education, Carnegie Institute of Technology*

17

1. I think it is important to have reliable statistics on Jewish immigration. Anti-Semites will get the figures or manufacture them; in any case, they will exaggerate them tenfold.

2. I am not in a position to make a definite recommendation, but somewhere, under "Religion," "Nationality," "Race" or other classification, a Jew should be able to identify himself as such.

3. One is a member of a "race" more by definition than by birth. I do not recommend that Jews be referred to as members of a "Hebrew race." The choice should be open to an immigrant to state that he is a Jew by religious affiliation or nationality or both, or that his parents could be classified as belonging to the Jewish denomination or nationality or both.

Milton R. Konvitz, *Faculty, New York University*

18

1. I see no reason from a governmental viewpoint or for purposes of control of immigration for gathering exact data on Jews. There is no more reason for it than to gather data on Catholics, Protestants, Greek Orthodox, Mohammedan immigrants. Of course, if you assume that the Jews are a race (biologically and anthropologically speaking) the question takes a different form.

2. I approve the decision. I cannot see any harm in it, but on the contrary some gain. It will bring less focusing of attention on the Jew as such, hence tend to lessen anti-Semitism.

24

1. Preferable to have exact data—see no adequate objection.

2. See below.

3. In my judgment it would be desirable to have recorded both the country of origin, and the ethnic or racial designation, according to a classification specially prepared for this purpose. Some formula could be found for persons of mixed ethnic derivation—itself a frequent (and probably desirable) occurrence.

R. M. MacIver, *Columbia University*

25

1. Yes [it is important to have exact data]. No [I see no reason for refraining from collecting these data].

2. No. There is no such thing as a Hebrew race. I see no reason for treating Jews differently from any other class of people. I'd have the Im. and N. Service give up its race categories—except white, black, yellow and I doubt the utility of that. But it is important to get some data about immigrants—age, sex, education, religion, country of birth, country of residence, occupation, marital state, etc.

3. "Jew" or "Hebrew" is not a race, or a "chosen people" or a class deserving of any special consideration. It is a religion. People called Jews are a class whose culture is largely conditioned by their religion. That's all. The sooner they get this into their heads—and the sooner non-Jews get it into *their* heads—the better. Jews should "assimilate": forget about their separatism and become *merely* a religious class—and a very decent religion it is, as religions go. You see I am no Zionist. I want American Jews to stay here.

Read Bain, *Professor of Sociology, Miami University*

26

1. My answer to both parts of question 1 is yes. Reliable statistics regarding Jews are difficult to obtain, partly at least because of the difficulty of defining "Jew." The immigration statistics used to provide one relatively reliable source of data. It would be desirable to improve that source rather than eliminate it entirely. On the other hand the treatment of Jews as a specially designated group in any immigration records would tend to increase the undesirable conspicuousness of Jews. Since, however, the statistics could not otherwise be obtained, I would be willing to risk the conspicuousness.

2. I approve of the deletion of the term "Hebrew" from the classification of immigrants in any case. "Hebrew" seems to me to be a proper description in these days only of a language. It seems especially wrong as a designation for "a race." If statistics are to be secured regarding Jews, I prefer the description "Jew" or "Jewish" in any case. The best definition of a Jew that I have ever encountered defines a Jew as "one who thinks of himself or is thought of by others as belonging to the Jewish faith or people." In keeping with that definition, a blank on the immigration record to be filled in at the discretion of the immigrant might reveal those who thought of themselves as Jews, though it probably would not reveal those who were thought of by others as such. Such a blank need not be directed exclusively at Jews; it might read somewhat as follows: "If you believe that your nationality, religious, or racial affiliation is not accurately described by your answers to the above questions, please name the group or groups in which you think you should be included for accurate statistical purposes."

3. I do not consider "race" an appropriate designation for any contemporary group. "Color" (loosely interpreted) would be better for some groups that are meant, and "nationality" (also loosely interpreted) for others. The two together ought to elicit all the information that the term "race" was expected to derive.

Louis Gottschalk, *Professor of Modern History, University of Chicago*

27

1. From a research point of view I'd like to have the data, provided we also got comparable data on out-migration. From a personal point of view I object in a democracy to any separation of data of this sort in a way that, whatever the intent, carries a religious connotation. I suppose I lean a bit more to this point than to the other.

2. [No answer.]

3. No. By country or origin. I distrusted racism even before Hitler.

Edmund Brunner, *In charge, Rural Sociology, Columbia University*

28

1. Yes [important to have exact data]—provided the element of religious (Jewish) affiliation is recorded.

2. Yes, provided there is also a classification by religious affiliation to indicate Jewish religion; because those of non-Jewish religion intermarry with others and are soon lost or merged with the dominant (majority) race and/or religious groups.

3. No, better classify by (1) nationality, (2) mother tongue (native language).

F. Stuart Chapin, *Chairman, Dept. of Sociology, University of Minnesota*

divisions within the so-called Caucasoid, giving pseudo-racial captions such as Dinaric, Nordic, Alpines, Mediterraneans, Irano-Afgans, Jews, and the like. All such attempts have been no more than passing fads. For at the present stage of scientific research no proof has been given as to the boundaries of a so-called Nordic subdivision or Jewish subdivision or any other subdivision of the Caucasoids. There is indisputably no Nordic Race or Hebrew Race. Since all race classifications are in constant process of revision in scientific circles, no democratic government is warranted in erecting the evanescent guesswork of an immature scientific field into captions for classificatory purposes or for purposes of individual designations.

Nor can religious identification or ancestry be labeled with any better accuracy. As citizens of a democracy we grant the right of any person to dissociate himself from the religious body of some or all of his ancestors. We grant his right to disclaim identification with that ancestry, should it be his wish to do so. As democratic American citizens we must be unswerving in our insistence that religious identification of any kind is a personal matter. It is no matter for others to pry into. It has no place as a matter of record in the files of the Immigration Service. If we put together religion and race, if we confuse the one with the other, we are doing a very foolish thing. Science has no patience with such idiocies.

Only national origins of the individual, his parents, and perhaps his grandparents, are capable of relatively efficient determination. It is only such national origins that ought to be matters of record in governmental files in a democracy. The special scientific research departments which may be set up under governmental auspices—certainly the Immigration Service is not such a department—are the only governmental bodies which can properly interest themselves in matters of research into religious or racial problems. Jews and Jewish organizations should direct their queries to such scientific bureaus, or advocate the setting up of such bureaus, if Jewish organizations as such cannot compile the data that may be desired, or if private scientific foundations are unavailable for the purposes of the research.

Melville Jacobs, *Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of Washington*

39

1. The reasons for having exact data in Jewish immigration are compelling. Jewish immigration after the war will be a political issue and lack of accurate data will give demagogues opportunities to present the problem in a biased manner.

2. I would retain the term "Hebrew." A change in the term might cause a break in the continuity of the statistics. Besides, the adoption of a new classification is connected with a great deal of administrative and legal routine which is probably not advisable to suggest at this time.

3. Classification of immigrants according to race is inappropriate. Instead I would suggest the use of the term "ethnic affiliation." This term which is gaining currency of late indicates linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In regard to classifying immigrants under major geographic or political divisions I wish to record the criticism made by Mr. E. Dana Durand, Director of the Census, in his letter to Congress in 1910: "Aside from the scientific value of a report of nationality, it appears that the members of some of the nationalities which are now largely represented in our population feel strongly opposed to a disregard of nationality in the census reports. The various Slavic nationalities coming from Austria-Hungary appear almost unanimously to object to be reported as born in Austria or Hungary, unless the additional information showing their nationality [race, not political allegiance] is presented, so that they will not be supposed to be Austrians or Hungarians." This statement was made at a time when the term "race" wasn't so much confused.

If anything, Mr. Durand's argument for retaining ethnic (racial) identity of the immigrant for statistical analysis is more valid today than 30 years ago. The Poles, the Czechs, the Jews, for instance, who might have resided for many years in Germany and speak German will not wish to be recorded as Germans but rather under their own ethnic group designation. It will be an act of great injustice to record them as Germans.

Dr. Uriah Z. Engelman, *Buffalo, N. Y.*

40

1. I consider it very important to have exact data on the immigration of Jews to the United States.

2. I do not approve of the decision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. From a purely practical and technical point of view, I recomend a return to the previous procedure.

3. I consider the classification of immigrants according to race inappropriate. I would suggest designation by (1) Birthplace (2) Citizenship (3) Descent.

Example 1:	*Birthplace*:	Moravia
	Citizenship:	Czechoslovak
	Descent:	Slovak
Example 2:	*Birthplace*:	Russia
	Citizenship:	Polish
	Descent:	Jewish
Example 3:	*Birthplace*:	Germany
	Citizenship:	German
	Descent:	Jewish

I. Dijour, *Executive Secretary, Hias-Ica Emigration Association (Hicem)*

41

1. It is important to have exact data on Jewish immigration to the United States for the Jews are an important racial-cultural group.

2. Keep it until a better term can be found or developed.

3. Classification according to "race" is not only inaccurate but furthers a usage of a term which has no scientific foundation, but in many cases it is the best term available. "Race" is sound only if by it is meant a racial-cultural group with the emphasis on *cultural*.

E. S. Bogardus, *University of Southern California*

42

1. I agree that it is important to have exact data on the immigration of Jews into this country. I do feel, however, that the term race is inappropriate as applied to any religious nationality or cultural group.

2. I would recommend a return to the use of the word Hebrew unless some more scientific classification can be established. Obviously the factors of biological type, nationality, religion, and culture are pretty much confused.

3. It follows from above that I do not regard the term "race" appropriately used at the present time. If more specific recording were feasible, I would recommend classification and cross-classification according to (1) Place of birth; (2) Prior citizenship; (3) Physical type (Caucasian, Mongolian, Negro, etc.); (4) Religious background appropriately defined and (5) Language as evidence of cultural identification. A person with a background in the Jewish religion speaking Yiddish and familiar with the Hebrew language would be pretty definitely Jewish in the ordinary sense of the term. The term Jew or Hebrew might still be used for purposes of self-identification. In one sense a Jew is a person who would voluntarily identify himself with the word standing for a cultural group. I see no way of unraveling the present complexity in a way compatible with simple statistical classification.

Clifford Kirkpatrick, *Professor of Sociology, University of Minnesota*

43

1. Yes, I would like to see exact data on immigration of Jews collected.

2. Hence, I do not approve of the deletion of the term "Hebrew" although, of course, I do not like this term either.

3. I think immigration terminology should be brought in line with modern scientific thought on the score of immigrants. They should probably be classified by race in the technical anthropological sense of the word; language of orienting family; and religion. This would give decisive information concerning incoming Jews and all other immigrants.

I don't see why the American Anthropological Association could not be asked to appoint a committee to consult with the Department of Labor on this problem and work out a better classification in the light of all the problems.

John Dollard, *Professor, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University*

44

Thank you for your letter. I feel hardly qualified to offer comment on the question you raise. Certainly argument is possible. I know that there has been criticism of the treatment of refugees on the ground that the State Department has facilitated the entry of Jewish refugees and has been making it more difficult for others to enter. I do not think that this criticism is valid, but it has been made. As a consequence, the Department may desire to render it meaningless by so classifying immigrants as to make the question purely academic. On the other hand, I quite appreciate the desirability of having a record. It seems to me your point is well made. I suppose in all such matters, the only thing one could do is to weigh the pros and cons and decide which course of reasoning seems more desirable.

George N. Shuster, *President, Hunter College*

45

1. I can't say how important such exact data may be. It certainly would be interesting and probably of great value to the social scientist. I can see no reason for omitting such information if it can be accurately obtained. But if the classification is inaccurate, then it is better omitted.

2. I should recommend recording the nationality in every case possible and in addition any minority group or ethnic subdivision to which the immigrant adheres. Thus an immigrant from Czechoslovakia would be listed as a national of that country and in addition sublisted as a German, a Czech, or a Slovak. Immigrants from Russia as Russians and also as Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Jew, Moldavian or what not.

3. The use of "race" in the cited instructions is wholly inaccurate. It is incorrectly made synonymous with nationality. It is very discouraging that such an error persist after so much has been written and said to clarify the concept.

H. L. Shapiro, *American Museum of Natural History*

46

1. It is very important to have exact information of Jewish immigration into this country, if for no other purpose than to counteract false and misleading statements concerning Jews in America that are issued from time to time from various sources. Exact information is a weapon

57

1. I have rather mixed feelings on this question. I regret very much to lose identity of Hebrews in the immigration statistics. On the other hand, I have always thought it somewhat unfortunate to mix racial and religious categories. We have heretofore had the injection of a religious group within a classification by "race."

2. From the standpoint of the demographer I think it would be fine to have a straight classification by religion in addition to other descriptive classifications. I understand, however, that the immigration laws make no provision for collection of these data. I suspect that proposals to amend the laws in this direction would encounter opposition.

3. Scientific opinion with regard to definition of "race" has changed somewhat toward more strictly physical and anthropometric terms. In keeping with this it seems to me that more objective classifications such as those based upon country of birth and "mother tongue" (to accompany conventional classification on basis of country of last residence) are preferable to "race."

Clyde V. Kiser, *Demographer, Milbank Memorial Fund*

58

1. Although information on the number of Jewish arrivals is valuable yet the recording of Jews as a separate and special entity would serve no good purpose.

2. [No answer.]

3. A number of national Jewish agencies are studying this matter with the view to finding a way whereby the desired information can be had.

I. L. Asofsky, *Executive Director, Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society of America*

59

1. Yes [it is important to have exact data].

2. I would subject the whole problem to thorough study by an able committee of social scientists.

3. Ditto. However, personally I do not believe the "race" concept to be entirely satisfactory.

Lt. F. M. Zorbaugh, USNR, *formerly Professor of Sociology, Oberlin College*

60

1. Yes [it is important to have exact data].

2. I would suggest that two terms be used: (a) nationality; (b) country of origin.

In this case, nationality would be designated as *Jewish* and country of origin—Russia or Poland or Rumania, etc.

3. Unqualifiedly inappropriate. I would suggest *nationality.*

Joseph Baskin, *General Secretary, Workmen's Circle*

61

1. According to your own statement, and as everyone knows, *exact* data on Jews is impossible because the category has never been adequately defined. Why try to keep alive the nonsense of a Jewish "race?" Actually the category is only a religious or cultural designation and any attempt to make a special case of it merely increases anti-Semitism. I approve of the decision of the Immigration authorities.

2. I think all attempts to make a special case of the Jews are unfortunate—for the Jews—and should be opposed by them.

3. No. They should be classified according to nationality (citizenship) or any other criterion that is considered relevant *and* objectively definable. Religious affiliation, or vague cultural affinities, or organized cultural groups seeking special privileges or immunities, are not categories that should be recognized.

George A. Lundberg, *Professor of Sociology and Statistics, Bennington College*

For further statement of his views, Professor Lundberg was kind enough to enclose copies of his correspondence with a gentleman who wished to include Professor Lundberg's name as one of the sponsors of a new society for the study of Jewish problems.

62

1. The history of Jewish immigration is important and interesting to Jews and non-Jews. They are a group with great social solidarity; they are a subject of great controversy in Europe (the source of immigration); such data would explain many currents of thought and action in many fields. Therefore they should be identified.

2. I do not recommend a return to the previous practice. The confusion arising from the wholly inaccurate use of the terms "race," "nationality" and nation, wholly inaccurate and misleading, should be eliminated.

In accordance with the best practice, "race" should refer to a physical type and not be applied to a political entity such as German and French. The terms "German" etc., should refer to a person's identification and affiliation with a political unit, that is, citizenship in a country. However this still leaves those cultural groups that cannot appropriately be classified under the above two categories. Thus a person may be of German language and culture, but a citizen in Italy; he may be a Pole in Russia, a Mexican in Arizona. Such groups as the Poles have maintained their cultural consciousness through many years of statelessness. Where would the Jews fall? There are those who consider the

pted as completely scientific data by the social ield.

s, Mr. W. W. Husband, then Assistant Com- wrote to me asking my opinion regarding the n mother tongue classification in the forth- him that I thought it would be very valu- ne similar classification in the immigration o sets of tables constitute major information ution of Jews in this country.

hese many years, for the omission of this tion statistics. It would merely bring us ion, uncertainty and practical hopelessness icture of the facts regarding the Jews in e differing opinions as to how Jews were , just as there are now. Whether, in the be regarded as a religious group or as a as the issue then, as presented to the the Commissioner of Immigration before n of "Hebrew" was introduced. Sound tical considerations led to the conclusion rate statistically and hide under various emselves closely united and interested

antial reason that should have dictated n fully opposed, as a student in the field o such change.

Chairman, Department of Sociology, *ge*

138

no valid reasons for refraining from nigration of Jews into the U. S. On ble for purposes of social-economic a picture as possible of the social, of the American people.

rants according to "race" is not in iological concepts. The appropriate eem to me to be: (a) by color; y of origin, and (d) by national- y identify himself with a particular

Washington, D. C.

139

1. The dislocation of the Hebrew population in the present period has been so far-reaching that information on their immigration to the United States becomes highly important as identification of a social group of immense significance for national policy, attitude, and program.

2. My impression is that the simplest way to obtain information is to include the word "Hebrew" in the classification of immigrants. I wish, however, that you might find it possible to appoint a small committee of social scientists to discuss the matter with representatives of the Census Bureau. Our experience with such procedure has been very satisfactory, as the officials of the Census Bureau are always cooperative.

3. While objections to the word "race" are obvious, no other word seems to convey the same meaning. A better term or phrase might be discovered through the process of conference suggested in the answer to question 2.

Mary van Kleeck, *Director of Industrial Studies, Russell Sage Foundation*

[140]

DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS

OTTAWA, December 2, 1944
CANADA

Dear Sir:

I have your letter of November 17, re the question of racial origin and religion in the Canadian Census.

I may say that the first Canadian Census and Statistics Act, which was passed in 1870, mentioned specifically that the Census must ascertain the racial origin and religion of every person in Canada. On a few occasions, the Act was amended in certain particulars, but these two subjects have always remained in the Act. The collection of these facts has always been, therefore, so far as Canadian Census practice goes a matter of compliance with the law.

There has never been any public discussion on the advisability of removing the question of religion from the Census. There seems to be unanimity of opinion on the desirability of such information.

At various times, however, there has been a certain amount of controversy on the question of racial origin. The question was debated on two or three occasions in the House of Commons. In the Census of 1891, the question was limited to the counting of the French Canadians separately from the others. In 1901, the information was again ascertained in detail and it has been retained ever since.

The opponents of the question may be divided into two classes. 1. Those who think that such a question is detrimental to Canadian unity and who claim that once a person has acquired citizenship he should be classified as "Canadian" regardless of where his ancestors came from. This obviously confuses the two concepts of racial extraction and nationality. The other group criticizes the practice because they claim that it is not accurate from an ethnological point of view. The racial origin is traced through the paternal line of ancestry. Cases occur where a man of a certain racial group will marry a woman of another racial group and then for many generations the male descendants will marry into other racial groups so that the descendants will have practically nothing left of the male ancestor but the name. This group claims, then, that the figures shown by the census are not a correct measurement of the racial groups in the country.

On the other hand, there is still another group which claims that the various elements which make up the Canadian population have not yet reached complete homogeneity and that the query on racial origin, though far from perfect, should be retained because when studied in relation with other facts ascertained by the census, it provides a yardstick for the measurement of the degree of assimilation of the various elements into one unit. This group also claims that when, if ever, the Canadian population has reached a sufficient degree of homogeneity to form a unit, it will be of considerable interest to know what elements entered, and in what approximate proportion they entered to form a new Canadian group.

Reference to this question may be found in the Parliamentary Debates of the House of Commons; in particular, 1900, pp. 10,333 and fol., 1901, pp. 3,068 and fol., and in Hansard of August 11, 1944.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of a paper which Mr. H. Marshall, Assistant Dominion Statistician, read before the meeting of the Provincial Vital Statistics and also a copy of our Monograph on the "Racial Origins and Nativity of the Canadian People."

Trusting that these few notes will be of value to you, I am,

Yours truly

(*Signed*) O. A. LEMIEUX,
Chief, Census Branch.

THE NEED FOR SPECIFIC DATA ON JEWISH IMMIGRATION

By Jacob Lestchinsky

The issue raised by the Yivo has two aspects: one is purely academic, but the other which is socio-political should not be overlooked precisely because it concerns the Jews.

The quip of "Is it good for Jews?" contains, unfortunately, a sad truth. In this particular case, however, the academic exigencies and the socio-political interests are identical.

Let us first consider the academic side. We assume that the student of immigration into the United States is interested in learning of the conditions in the countries of emigration. It is known that the composition of emigrants due to economic crises differs from that due to religious persecutions; political crises or national persecutions supply quite different groups of emigrants. From the point of view of the country of immigration it is important to know not only the social and cultural pattern of the immigrants, but also the causes which drove these people from their homes. The stability of the immigrant, his fitness for the needs of the country of immigration, his allegiance to his new country, and his ability to adjust to the economic and cultural conditions prevailing are all considerations of the greatest significance, which necessitate that we study not only the physiognomy of the immigrants, but inquire also into the causes of their emigration. It is obvious that the psychic state of the immigrant persecuted for his political beliefs or discriminated against for his nationality differs from that of an immigrant suffering from an economic crisis. The detailed questionnaires of the Immigration and Naturalization Service bespeak the strong interest of the Government in all these matters. I state quite categorically, however, that the deletion of the rubric "Hebrew" will destroy the value of all the data regarding immigrants from a great number of countries with compact Jewish settlements.

This thesis may be illustrated by actual situations prior to the outbreak of the present war. The number of Jewish immigrants from such countries as Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Lithuania, and Latvia was so significant in the entire composition of immigrants and their family structure and social, economic, and cultural factors so distinct and different from the other immigrants of these countries that the

omission of the Jewish category would make worthless the data concerning the immigrants from the countries mentioned. No, not worthless, but injurious, because they would give an absolutely false picture leading to false conclusions.

Let us take one example. From 1919 to 1922, 128,537 persons immigrated into the United States from Poland. Suppose that the category "Hebrew" no longer existed at that time in the immigration statistics and the Jews, since they came from Poland, were included in the Polish figures. We would then find that emigrants from Poland were: 125,265 Poles—97.5%, 758 Ukrainians[1]—0.6%, and 1,203 Germans—0.9%. The conclusion would be that in the newly formed Poland Poles more than others suffered from the economic crisis which forced their emigration to the United States. In the minds of readers of these statistics would perhaps lurk the thought that the Poles were very irresponsible since even in the first years of their national independence they left their fatherland and sought their fortunes overseas. And still another idea may arise: that the German and Ukrainian minorities, who emigrated to a much smaller degree than their ratio in the population, were probably so well settled economically that they could surmount the crisis more easily than the dominant majority.

Fortunately there was, however, at that time the category "Hebrew" and thus it may be shown that this was not at all the case. In fact, just the opposite was true. Not only did the Poles not emigrate in such numbers, but four or five times as many as emigrated departed from the United States to return to their fatherland. Thus, the economic crisis did not diminish the number of Poles in Poland; on the contrary, tens of thousands of Poles who had settled in the United States returned to their native country.

Let us take a look at the figures of immigration into the United States for the years in question (1919-1922) and determine the percentage of each of these peoples in the Polish population:

People	Per Cent in the Polish Population	Immigration into the U. S. Number	Per Cent
1. Jews	10.5	100,921	78.5
2. Poles	63.9	24,344	18.9
3. Ukrainians	15.0	758	0.6
4. Germans	3.7	1,023	0.9

We can see that the number of Poles emigrating was 3.4 times less than their ratio in the population; Jews emigrated 7.5 times more

[1] In the official United States classification they are called Ruthenians (Russniaks).

than their proportion in the population and the proportion of the two other peoples emigrating also was much smaller than their percentage in the total population would warrant. It is thus clear that primarily Jews had to emigrate (had to, because emigration is not a pleasant undertaking that gives enjoyment) and not Poles, to whose number the United States immigration statistics would have added the Jews, if there had been no rubric "Hebrew."

But even the picture just presented does not give a full account of the real causes of the emigration from Poland and of those whom these causes most affected. Only when we acquaint ourselves with the data on departures from the United States to Poland does the picture become entirely clear.

From 1919 to 1922 the departures from the United States to Poland were:

People	Departures from the U. S. Number	Per Cent	In Relation to 100 Immigrants
1. Jews	528	0.56	0.5
2. Poles	89,959	95.35	369.5
3. Ukrainians	428	0.45	56.5
4. Germans	76	0.08	6.3

Now we can see how correct data may reveal the true causes of a social phenomenon, whereas false figures may veil and distort an important social phenomenon. In fact only Jews emigrated from Poland. As many as 3.7 times more Poles re-emigrated to Poland than persons who left the country. The situation with the Ukrainians is not exactly the same, but even so we cannot point to a serious loss of the Ukrainian population in Poland because of emigration.

A similar, or an even more distorted, picture of emigration from Rumania could be obtained. In 1933, for example, the Jewish emigrants from Rumania constituted 59.9% of all emigrants. If the Jews were classified as Rumanians, it would then seem that the emigration of Rumanians was much more intense than that of the Ukrainian, Magyar, or German minorities.

If all European peoples were deleted from the immigration statistics and only registration of citizenship introduced, then we could justify the new ruling of the Immigration Service. But if only Jews are omitted and they alone of all peoples are ascribed to the majority people of the country (which normally furnishes the relatively lowest figure of all emigrants), then the entire "race" statistics are worthless for all those countries in which Jews generally constitute a large proportion and from which they usually emigrate in a greater percentage than their ratio in the population. All the special characteristics of the

Polish, Rumanian, Hungarian, Lithuanian, and Latvian immigrants are thus obliterated or falsely depicted.

Let us now take up another question: where do the Polish immigrants settle after their arrival in the United States? Until now statistics have always shown that the number of Jews who remain in New York is two and three times greater than that of the Poles, whose tendency is to disperse. If the figures of Jews and Poles are intermingled, it will then appear that more than one-half of the Poles remain in New York. This will be true, too, of the Rumanians, Lithuanians, and others. In this way the whole picture will become distorted.

A third question: at whose cost do the immigrants come here? The figures show that twice as many Jews come to the United States as Poles on the expenditures of relatives here. When the category "Hebrew" is omitted, it will seem that from now on a greater proportion of Poles come here on the costs of their relatives. This will hold true for Rumanians, Magyars, and so on.

Even greater confusion will arise from the figures on occupational distribution: we shall have large numbers of immigrant Poles, Rumanians, Magyars, Lithuanians who are falsely classified as clothing workers and hatters, while, for example, the Jews in Poland constituted more than 90% of the hatters.

Only one of two alternatives is possible: either the registration of citizenship (political allegiance) only or the registration of all races or peoples without exception.

All these arguments relate to the need of the United States as a whole to know about its immigrants. Let us look at the other aspect of the question: the needs of the Jews themselves.

First of all I should say that we should be in favor of the minutest possible data about Jews in all countries of the world. The least suspicion that Jews seek means to avoid being counted—whether in censuses or immigration or in any other case—must, and rightly so, arouse mixed feelings even among our non-Jewish friends. We certainly have nothing to hide and no fear of the truth. On the contrary, we are vitally interested in having official data concerning the various aspects of our lives.

I do not believe that accurate information about the Jews will checkmate anti-Semitism, but fight against it we must with accurate information, whether or not we want to. We must argue with open and hidden foes—we are actually always in constant debate with enemies and antagonists. Our friends in the Christian world would be confused if we could not supply accurate information with which to refute the talk of our enemies. We are far from being so certain of our position that we may ignore the pins with which our enemies prick us. Now, it is obvious that

each official figure carries much more weight than any obtained by private agencies. Such statistics, no matter how objectively or scrupulously arrived at, will never have the same authoritativeness that the official figures of a government agency have.

Let us again illustrate with a few examples our need for official data about Jewish immigration into the United States and how valuable these official data are for us.

Those who have clamored for the restriction of immigration have often argued that people come to the United States to make money and then take it out of the country. In this connection they have in one form or other pointed out the Jews. The official figures on departures from the United States for 1908 to 1925 (from the time when statistics by "race or people" were first introduced for departures)[2] are typical.

The percentage of departees in relation to the immigration of each people from 1908 to 1925 was[3]:

Rumanians	67.0	Lithuanians	25.4
Magyars	64.2	English	19.0
Italians	55.8	Germans	15.3
Poles	40.0	Jews (Hebrews)	5.2

These figures need no commentary and are adequate for refuting the aforesaid arguments of the seasonal quality of the immigration insofar as it concerns the Jews.

Lt us consider a much more important question: the occupational structure of the immigrants. An attitude based on some tradition and on an incorrect superficial impression has been formed concerning this question. There was a time when the majority of the Jewish immigrants, even from Eastern Europe and certainly from Western Europe, consisted of trade and declassed elements. This was in the nineties of the nineteenth century. Later the situation changed considerably. But the impression has become firmly rooted that Jewish immigrants always constituted trade and declassed elements. Since one peddler or storekeeper is more noticeable than ten workers or artisans, the percentage of immigrants who took to peddling or storekeeping obscured the ten times greater percentage who went into the shops and factories. The official data on the occupational structure of the immigrants present a very interesting picture indeed. We shall take the figures from 1900 to 1925, because from then on immigration was selected on the basis of quotas and those data are, therefore, not indicative.

[2] The years up to 1925 are taken into consideration because until then immigration was free and unrestricted by quotas which aroused fear among those already admitted and held many back from risking a return to Europe.

[3] Jacob Lestchinsky, "Jüdische Wanderungen im letzten Jahrhundert," *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv,* 1927, H. I., p. 82.

The Occupational Structure of Gainfully Employed Jewish and Non-Jewish Immigrants (1900-1925)[4]

Occupations	Jews		Non-Jews	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1. Industry	596,043	60.1	1,719,361	14.9
2. Trade	100,147	10.1	475,822	4.1
3. Agriculture	24,792	2.4	3,059,798	26.6
4. Professions	19,620	2.0	261,033	2.3
5. Unskilled workers	102,739	10.4	3,760,213	32.7
6. Domestic service	123,220	12.4	1,779,218	15.4
7. Others	25,769	2.6	456,111	4.0
Total	992,330	100.0	11,511,556	100.0

Skilled workers, artisans and manufacturers are included in the category "Industry." "Trade" comprises tradesmen, brokers, agents, employees. Among the Jews the industrial elements, which include over 90% self-employed craftsmen or workers in factories, constitute a percentage four times higher than that of the non-Jews. Only one-tenth were engaged in some form of trade. If to the skilled workers and artisans are added the unskilled laborers, domestic servants and farmers, we shall have over 85% engaged in manual labor. With the inclusion of the professionals, there will then be to any way of thinking over 87% of productive elements. This is the real composition of Jewish immigration and those who argue that Jewish immigrants consist of either trade or declassed elements are either unacquainted with the facts or are slanderers.

Thus, are these official data not the best weapon against the anti-Semitic thesis that the country is overrun with Jews who do not possess any capital or qualifications? It is possible that the clothing industry, which is certainly a product of Jewish enterprise and is now one of the largest branches of industry in the United States, would not have been able to develop so rapidly and intensely if not for the fact that every year it was enriched by a new stream of tens of thousands of Jewish clothing workers with specific skills. On the other hand, it is incorrect to assume that skilled workers among the Jewish immigrants were exclusively cloakmakers and operators. They were not by far. Of the cited close to 600,000 skilled workers only 221,446 or 37% were clothing workers. To these should be added the 85,226 women operators in the clothing trades, together comprising over 300,000 or a little more than a half of the skilled labor elements among the Jewish immigrants. But there were also 44,426 locksmiths and blacksmiths, 53,615 carpenters and builders, 23,011 painters and glaziers, 34,678 butchers and bakers,

[4] Jacob Lestchinsky, "Die berufliche Zusammensetzung der jüdischen Einwanderung in die Vereinigten Staaten," *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 1928, H. I., p. 171.

and many shoemakers, jewellers, watchmakers, barbers, printers, and craftsmen of other trades. Almost half of the Jewish immigrant workers were not in the clothing industry.

In conclusion, I should like to say just a few words about the purely socio-political aspect of the question. Whether the European Jews constitute a "national" or religious group is not for anyone in the United States to determine. A very peculiar situation, however, arises when the immigration authorities in effect decree so. It does not matter what motives are used to veil the decision to delete the rubric "Hebrew" from the category of races and peoples and to retain all the other ethnic groups of the multi-national countries. The result is that the Immigration Service has decided: three Ukrainians arriving here from Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia are not Russian, Polish, or Czech, but belong to the Ukrainian race or people; but three Jews arriving together with the Ukrainians from Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia do not belong to the Jewish race or people, but one is a Russian, the second a Pole, and the third a Czech.

The question of whether the word "race" is an appropriate term or should be replaced by another word interests me considerably less. The essence lies in the content and not in the name. I do think, though, that the unscientific and rather compromised term should be replaced by *ethnic group*.

FORTY-FIVE YEARS OF CONTROVERSY: SHOULD JEWISH IMMIGRANTS BE CLASSIFIED AS JEWS?

By Nathan Goldberg

1

The classification of Jewish immigrants as Hebrews has been a subject of controversy ever since 1899, when the U. S. Commissioner General of Immigration published the results of the first analysis of the "racial" origin of those admitted to the United States between July, 1898 and June, 1899.

It was the influx of relatively large numbers of immigrants from Eastern and Central Europe that had led to the collection of more accurate data on the newcomers and to their classification by race. Advocates of selective immigration hoped that the results of such studies would strengthen their position. Those who wanted to help the immigrants in their adjustment to the American environment were also interested in data on their social background.

Commissioner General of Immigration Terence V. Powderly[1] introduced the system of "racial" classification. In his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1898, he pointed out the shortcomings of the system of statistics then in use by the Bureau of Immigration and said:

> Believing the subject [accurate data on immigrants] to be one of such vital moment to the people of the United States that every means should be sought to put them in possession of all accessible and practically useful information in relation thereto, a committee has within the past few weeks been appointed for the purpose of devising an improved system which shall, as near as may be, accomplish this design. . . .
>
> The new reports give, in addition to the data furnished by those now in use, arrivals of immigrants by race; thus, Jews, from whatever country they migrate hither; Germans, whether from Austria, Germany, or France; English from Great Britain, India,

[1] Powderly (1849-1924) was at first active in the trade union movement and was General Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, 1879-1893; chief of the U. S. Immigration Bureau, 1897-1902; then Chief of the Division of Information of the Bureau of Immigration, member of the Board of Review of this Bureau, Commissioner of Conciliation in the Department of Labor. Cf. *History of the Jewish Labor Movement in the United States* [in Yiddish], II, Yivo, New York, 1945, pp. 29, 31, 33, 34, 337.

South Africa, Australia, or Canada, etc. Such a distribution by race appears much more rational than the present one, which simply reports the countries whence the immigrants respectively come, and gives no clue to their characteristics and their resultant influence upon the community of which they are to become members.[2]

In his report for the year ended June 30, 1899, Powderly called attention to the new classification of immigrants which he had just introduced:

> In addition to showing the recent geographical or political origin of aliens who come to this country to settle, there is shown also the distinctive race to which they respectively belong, using the word 'race' in its popular rather than in its strict ethnological sense; so that, from an experience of the distinguishing occupations of each race, its moral, mental, and physical characteristics, and their development under American institutions, a basis may be formed for estimating its effect upon the population and industries of the United States. From this aspect an Englishman does not lose his race characteristics by coming from South Africa, a German his by coming from France, or a Hebrew his, though he come from any country on the globe (p. 5).

There were included in Powderly's first list of forty-nine races besides Hebrew, Irish, Welsh, and other groups that also did not constitute then independent political entities, Hungarian and Magyar and Rumanian and Wallachian. The list was subsequently revised. In 1902 the expression "race or people" was introduced in place of "race."

We also find surprisingly in this report data on the religion of the newcomers. Of them 37,415 were Jews by race (Hebrews) and 37,523 by religion (Israelites).[3] As we shall see, this is the only report which contains such information.

Simon Wolf, chairman of the Board of Delegates on Civil and Religious Rights of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, took exception to the classification of Jewish immigrants as Hebrews and Israelites. He told Commissioner Powderly that such classification would strengthen "the hands of the anti-Semitic countries by officially regarding the Jews of a country, even if of generations of native descent, as not partaking of the nationality of their fatherland." He further argued that the collection of data on the religion of immigrants was a violation of the Constitution of the United States and called Powderly's attention to the opinion of the U. S. Attorney General that the Census Bureau had no constitutional right to collect data on religion.[4]

Powderly did not agree with these views. On April 7, 1899, he

[2] Commissioner-General of Immigration, *Annual Report,* 1898, pp. 33-34.
[3] Commissioner-General of Immigration, *Annual Report,* 1899, pp. 6, 13.
[4] Simon Wolf, *The Presidents I Have Known,* p. 258; Union of American Hebrew Congregations, *26th Annual Report,* 1899, p. 4121.

Rare Book Collection
ersity Libraries
34 5213

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

By Max Weinreich

1. The Aim of the Yivo Inquiry

The aim of the Yivo in undertaking the inquiry can be easily defined: we sought to establish a basis for an intelligent discussion of an important controversial problem.

The Yivo does not emphasize its scholarly character to the degree that it avoids in principle any action of a practical nature. If we were dealing with a matter that did not arouse such differences of opinion within the Jewish community, the Institute would see no objection to submitting a properly documented report to the authorities. But as the case now stands, that is before the views have been duly articulated, there is only one task before us: to supply material that may help to crystallize public sentiment not on the basis of slogans or stereotypes, but on the ground of independent thinking about this serious subject.

How serious it is, may be deduced both from the large number of replies that were received and from the lively interest manifested in many replies. How important it is to establish a basis for an intelligent discussion may be seen from the letters of persons, who, though specialists in their fields or communal leaders and workers of note, are reluctant to express a definite view. Some of the authors explicitly state that they are awaiting the results of our inquiry; others add that they discussed the matter among themselves before answering our questionnaire.

> I am not in a position to make a definite recommendation. [17]
>
> On the matter of policy, I am not prepared to give any advice. [35]
>
> . . . unable to form a definite opinion. [37]
>
> Certainly no judgment should be passed by me or any other person on so complicated a matter without intensive study. [66]
>
> I have been puzzled by your inquiry . . . [74]

Frankly, I myself was amazed to see how hesitant was the reaction even of some persons who had been engaged in this matter for years. One letter reads in part:

> Dr. H. S. Linfield, who prepares data for the U. S. Census Bureau, is firmly convinced that such classification is undesirable and some of the Jewish agencies, for example, the American

> Jewish Committee, concerned with public relation problems, seem to agree with Dr. Linfield. If this attitude is correct it is consistent to eliminate similar classifications from other government statistics. [5]

"If this attitude is correct" — but does the author agree with the point of view of Dr. Linfield?

Another author makes the following statement:

> . . . If a study of the need for some classification on so-called racial, cultural, ethnic, or even religious lines discloses that such classification has scientific value, then we think that such a classification should be prepared by competent scholars on the basis of generally accepted criteria. Should such a classification be deemed of value and should there be a logical place for Jews in it, then we would be again in position to have reliable data on Jewish immigration to the United States from official sources. If, however, such a classification is found not to be of value, or if such a classification is approved but there is no logical place in it for Jews, then it would be necessary for the Jewish community itself to take the steps required to secure the information which it needs. [119]

Again "if," "should," "should," "if," "however." Whence this uncertainty in a matter that is relatively simple compared with so many really intricate social problems? I can find only one explanation: the subject was never presented in its full extent; and we were very glad to hear from the author of the above quotation:

> We trust that the results of the investigation initiated by your Institute will be helpful in bringing about a fresh appraisal by competent experts of not only the classification by "race or people," but also of the entire series of statistical tables issued by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. [119]

I wish to point to a remark made by one of the persons we addressed: "Had you turned to two hundred other persons, wouldn't the results have been quite different?" The question would not have come up if the gentleman had seen our whole material in its compiled form. First of all, the variety of the replies, both as to position taken and the expression thereof, clearly shows that as far as possible our selection of addressees was unbiased. The views of most of the persons addressed were unknown to us. But the main thing is that we did not take any vote and did not even attempt to tabulate the answers. We do not count them; we weigh them. In the present survey, no reliance was placed on the number of times an opinion was expressed and, in quoting, the aim was not to exhaust the material. All I have attempted to do is to group the facts and arguments in a lucid fashion so as to facilitate analysis. I deliberately chose not to quote the authors under their names but to refer to their replies by the numbers under which they are printed.

It will be easy to identify the author of a sentence; but in my context I wanted an argument to stand on its own merit, regardless of the established authority of its author.

Hitherto, only one viewpoint on our subject had been presented to the public and that was why both non-Jewish and Jewish authors had the impression that this was *the* Jewish point of view.

> The Jews have long objected to this immigration regulation. [6]

Of course, such a generalization is unjust and cannot be justified by Dr. Linfield's statement that: "Since American Jews, like liberal public opinion generally, look upon..."[1] *Pars pro toto* serves well in poetry but not in public life. Even in the more patriarchal times of the beginning of the century, half of Simon Wolf's experts[2] disagreed with the view Dr. Linfield represents today, and Wolf himself submitted the opinions of his opponents to the government. True, he dismissed them as Zionists, but this is besides the point. We shall see, by the way, that the same erroneous connection of a particular view on our subject with Zionism is advanced also by some of our authors. In fact, the real cleavage, as the material of this inquiry reveals, is not between Zionism and non-Zionism, just as the adherence to this or that view does not depend on the person's being Jewish or not.

Some of the authors suppose that at least the majority of the Jews approve of the new ruling of the Immigration Service.

> . . . I feel that the Service was probably deferring to the wishes of most Jews now in America. [13]
>
> I . . . am certain that the majority of Jews of America will agree with the government in this matter. [67]

This may be true, but since no vote was ever taken, one cannot be sure. Even had a vote been taken, the outcome could still have been the result of insufficient knowledge or unconsidered judgment. Certainly no view should be imposed upon any one, but the very first requirement of democratic procedure is to bring adequate information to the largest possible number of people.

That is why we publish all replies received *in extenso*. Of course, my selection of quotations and the very arrangement of the present survey are motivated by a certain viewpoint; but, since the entire material

[1] *Statistics of American Jews. The United States Census of Religious Bodies.* By H. S. Linfield, Ph.D., Director, Jewish Statistical Bureau. February, 1944, p. 3. The matter discussed there is the U. S. census, but the principle remains unchanged. — I hasten to add that if any opinion on this subject is to be considered it is, of course, Dr. Linfeld's who has worked in the field of American Jewish statistics for a longer period and more intensely than any other single individual.

[2] See N. Goldberg's paper, pp. 94-96.

is open to every reader, he may, if sufficiently interested, arrive at a summary and conclusions of his own.

Some replies (5, 119) suggested a conference of institutions and persons concerned. We like the idea, but we feel that a conference would be infinitely more effective if its participants would be acquainted with the results of this inquiry and would have critically evaluated it in advance.

2. Reasons against the Collection of Exact Data on Jewish Immigration

Some correspondents had the impression, and rightly so, that our questionnaire and the covering letter suggested the desirability of compiling exact statistics. Not all addressees agree with us in this respect; some definitely think that such statistics should not be collected. Now and then, this idea is expressed without elaboration (13, 111, 123); but some replies do advance reasons which deserve to be heard.

a) The Immigration Service was not created for the purpose of compiling Jewish immigration statistics:

> However important data on immigration of Jews may be, the primary purpose of the Immigration and Naturalization Service must be to administer the law, not to collect statistics. Need for data on Jews and other groups should not be a primary consideration in administering the law. [106]

Hardly anyone would object to this statement in its present general form. But would not the same apply to obtaining, let us say, from the courts statistics on juvenile delinquency or on export from the Department of Commerce or on strikes from the Department of Labor? It seems that the immigration records can just as well have considerable additional value besides their direct purposes and

> . . . the new ruling . . . reduces the value of official statistics by reducing the extent and quality of their immediate information and makes them less useful for social research purposes. [6]

Incidentally, the above-quoted statement from reply 106 can be countered by the argument that the Immigration Service did not cease collecting the statistics completely. The question "race or people" has been retained in the records, with the single innovation that, instead of the forty-four answers possible previously, now, with the deletion of Hebrew, only forty-three possibilities remain. The cited author, therefore, in the second part of his reply presents some proposals for improving the procedure instead of abolishing it.

b) It is not worthwhile collecting the material; it cannot be exact anyway.

Because of the difficulty of distinguishing races, and because of the lack of accuracy of any of the methods now in use to allocate individuals to races, I am inclined to question that the statistics which we have had on the immigration of Jews can be very accurate. [29]

The problem is so complex that accurate information is impossible to secure. [30]

Since the term "Hebrew" is a religious one with a definition that does not at all coincide with the racial notion, I should expect a considerable number of ambiguous cases. Every ambiguous case reduces the value of the resulting statistics. [69]

I think that these doubts, however justified in theory, can hardly be of importance in practice. To find one's way through the conceptual maze of religion — race — people is difficult indeed (as will be shown by the discussion in the second part of this paper), but the immigrant is not asked to give a theoretical definition to satisfy the expert ("What is a Welshman?", "What is a Jew?"); the immigration officer simply wants to learn whether this particular immigrant is a Welshman, a Jew, or belongs to one of the other races or peoples enumerated in the official list.

c) It is not worthwhile to continue collecting the material, since also the previous statistics were not exact.

. . . I know that the conditions under which data on immigrants are collected are not such as to produce exactness. [116]

. . . it is recognized that the figures have not been entirely accurate in the past. [135]

. . . the term Hebrew . . . never functioned adequately. [133]

This argument sounds much more plausible; to disregard experience would be folly. But what, I venture to ask, is the reason for discrediting the figures published by the Immigration Service since 1899? Recently I came across a statement[3] that it was "presumptuous" to designate the government's figures as "confused." I would not go so far, because the government's work too is performed by people, people can err, and under a non-totalitarian government even an official in a Federal department may be wrong. But, to my knowledge, no one has up to the present proved the figures to be wrong.

The distrust expressed in the above quotations means, I take it, that a considerable number of Jewish immigrants did not register in the class of Hebrews when asked for "race or people" by the immigration officials. Let us, then, analyze two instances where the official statistics may be verified.

One is offered for the year 1898-1899. As Nathan Goldberg very

[3] H. S. Linfield, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

aptly reminds us in his paper, the immigration authorities of the United States during the first year of the new recording procedure asked the immigrants for their religion as well, and the result showed 37,415 Jews by race (Hebrew) as against 37,523 Jews by religion (Israelites). Thus, where there was an opportunity to check the statistics of the Immigration Service, they proved to be entirely reliable. The close correspondence of these figures will not surprise the student of Jewish life who remembers that on the threshold of the twentieth century, the United States attracted Eastern European Jews, bearers of a specific culture of their own, and that almost exclusively Jews of this kind came to America from 1898 until Hitler's seizure of power.

This reference to the Eastern Jews is by no means incidental. We know from a number of Eastern and Central European countries where the population was counted both by religion and nationality (ethnic affiliation) that the correlation religion—nationality was of great significance as far as the Jews were concerned. In countries where Jewish group life was strongest the number of Jews by religion (Israelites, or persons of Mosaic faith) coincided almost entirely with the number of Jews by ethnic affiliation. This was the case in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and to a somewhat smaller degree also in Poland. In a country like Czechoslovakia where Eastern and Western Jewry met, the number of Jews by religion was, as may be expected, much larger than the number of those who declared themselves Jews by ethnic affiliation.

In Germany, where the concept of ethnic affiliation was not even applied to Jews, they were counted by religion only. Thus it stands to reason that the German Jews reacted differently to the term Hebrew when, after an interval of several decades, Germany again became an emigration country in 1933.

Beginning with 1933, Jewish arrivals to the United States again consisted chiefly of German Jews, whose Jewishness was so greatly attenuated that it had frequently been Hitler who reminded them of their descent. In members of this group, we may anticipate stronger inhibitions to declaring themselves Hebrews, and, strange as it may sound, we are told that German Jews who escaped to America from the Nazis protested against being classed as Hebrews, preferring to be listed as members of the "German race." As immigration statistics show, 128,516 persons entered the United States from Germany from July 1, 1933, up to June 30, 1943. Of these immigrants, 97,321 (75.8%) indicated in reply to the question of race that they were Hebrews. There is, however, no reason to believe that the remaining 24.2% represented Jews who did not want to admit being Jews. To begin with, some "pure Aryans," too, left Germany for political reasons and their number